

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/531,046	DE VROE, KOEN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rodney B. White	3636	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Rodney B. White. (3) _____

(2) John H. Mion (#18,879). (4) _____

Date of Interview: 10 May 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 16-17, 19-21, 24-25, and 27-29.


Identification of prior art discussed: Renault, Satoh, and Hagiike.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


RODNEY B. WHITE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed a proposed Examiner's Amendment submitted by Applicant's Representative and how the structural differences between the present invention and the prior art used to reject the claims in the Final Rejection mailed 03/26/2007 and how those differences were being defined to overcome those rejections. Also, discussed certain 112/2nd problems where vague words such as "other" and "another" were used instead of the exact structure that was being defined and words that were omitted in the dependent claims. Discussed changing the words "another" and "other" to the structure being defined and adding those missing words to avoid any confusion or unclarity with those claims. The proposed Examiner's Amendment was agreed upon and entered as such.